



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,172	10/20/2003	Duane A. Lunsford	58683US003	2716
32692 7590 09/04/2007 3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			EXAMINER ZIRKER, DANIEL R	
			ART UNIT 1771	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com
LegalDocketing@mmm.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/689,172
Filing Date: October 20, 2003
Appellant(s): LUNSFORD ET AL.

MAILED
SEP 04 2007
GROUP 1700

Thomas M. Spielbauer
For Appellant

SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

As requested by the Board on page 3 of the Remand Order of April 30, 2007
(Issue 1) appellants have submitted a corrected Evidence Appendix for their Brief. As

Art Unit: 1771

regards Issue 2 which is set forth on pages 3-4 of the Remand Order the Examiner has the following observations. It is first and foremost noted that all prior art rejections based in whole or in part on EP '756 had been withdrawn by the Examiner in the Advisory Action of January 6, 2006 following the Final Rejection of October 28, 2005. Thus all earlier relied upon rejections based in some part on EP '756 are moot issues that are no longer needed to be considered by the Examiner. As regards appellants' comments, particularly in the Reply Brief, that EP '756 "teaches away" from the claimed invention the Examiner can only note that neither reference mentions the other, and Lange et al is totally silent with respect to the presence of ambifunctional silanes, a major element of the '756 primer system. In summary, it is the Examiner's firm conviction that the relied upon Lange et al does not teach away from the claimed invention. As regards the claimed no more than 3% by weight acrylic acid repeat units adhesive composition discussed by the Murray Declaration note the Examiner's comments beginning at page 3 of the Answer, 3 lines from the bottom of the page and continuing onto page 4. Here the Examiner states that although the only specific adhesive composition taught in Lange et al is the Murray Declaration discussed Scotch Brand Magic Tape acrylic composition, a specific trademark only identified composition whose specific composition are nowhere disclosed in the reference, even if one agrees with appellant that the claimed invention excludes this composition (which the Examiner does not), "there still remains the previously referred to disclosure of Col 4, lines 5-9 specifically stating that excellent results are obtained when using the disclosed primer to adhere "adhesives" to, e.g. polyester films". That is, note (Answer, page 4, next to last

Art Unit: 1771

line) that Col 4, lines 5-9 clearly teaches "...that the reference primer is very suitable as a primer for adhering adhesives to substrates , with no restriction whatsoever on the type of adhesive used".

Respectfully submitted,
/Daniel Zirker/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1771